

Attendance of the November 16, 2005 GMTF Meeting
(based on sign-in sheet)

Name	Agency
Adams, Hon. Steve	City of Riverside
Afsharian, Gita	Wilbur Smith Associates
Avol, Ed	USC Keck School of Medicine
Baldwin, Hon. Harry	City of San Gabriel
Barna, John	California BT&H
Brown, Hon. Art	City of Buena Park
Catz, Sarah	UC Irvine
Chankin, Deborah	Gateway Cities COG
Dale, Hon. Lawrence	City of Barstow
Daniels, Hon. Gene	City of Paramount
Farrington, Carl	South Coast Interfaith Council
Flickinger, Hon. Bonnie	City of Moreno Valley
Gurule, Hon. Frank	City of Cudahy
Gutierrez, Jose	City of Los Angeles
Heit, Karen	Gateway Cities COG
Herrera, Hon. Carol	City of Diamond Bar
Knox, Deadra	SCRRA
Kumar, Vin	Caltrans District 7
Loper, Meghan	Majestic Realty Co.
Lieu, Sue	SCAQMD
Lowenthal, Hon. Bonnie	City of Long Beach
Maun-DeSantis, Lena	Port of Los Angeles
Morales, Diane	Caltrans District 8
Neely, Sharon	ACE Construction Authority
Nord, Gregory	OCTA
Palmer, Charlene	Arcadis
Russell, Bruce	Carter and Burgess
Saunders, Christine	Port of Los Angeles
Schiermeyer, Carl	RCTC
Schoetzow, Eileen	LAWA
Smith, Michelle	Metro
Smith, Steve	SANBAG
Szerlip, Hon. Don	City of Redondo Beach
Wanda, Kathleen	Caltrans District 7
Warren, Elizabeth	LA Chamber of Commerce
Wilson, Joan	California Business, Transportation, and Housing Agency
Wright, Gregory	San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership



SCAG Staff

Alcock, Joe

Pfeffer, Nancy

Wong, Philbert



GOODS MOVEMENT TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 2005

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

Councilmember Art Brown, City of Buena Park, called the meeting to order. A list of those in attendance is included in the minutes. Self introductions were made.

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Mr. Carl Farrington spoke in reference to the proposed Southern California International Gateway intermodal facility and asked the committee to continue to explore ways to move goods in an environmentally friendly manner and to maximize the use of on-dock rail.

3.0 CONSENT CALENDAR

3.1 Approval Items

3.1.1 Approval of the October 19, 2005 Minutes

Motion to approve the October 19, 2005 Goods Movement Task Force minutes was seconded and accepted with no objections.

4.0 INFORMATION ITEMS

4.1 Update on the State Goods Movement Action Plan

Mr. John Barna, Deputy Secretary of Transportation, California Business Transportation and Housing Agency, presented this item. The State Goods Movement Action Plan was established by Governor Schwarzenegger earlier in 2005 as a cabinet level working group chaired by both Alan Lloyd, Agency Secretary of the California Environmental Protection Agency, and Sunne Wright McPeak, Agency Secretary of the California Business, Transportation and Housing Agency.



The goods movement industry is a major financial engine in California, being responsible for one in seven jobs. However, goods movement faces a number of challenges as cargo volume is expected to double in 15 years. First, goods movement is a major contributor to traffic congestion and a bottleneck to future growth. Second, there is a need to address port-related emissions, in particular ship emissions. Third, goods movement security is a major issue that must be addressed. For example, the federal government must do more to inspect and secure containers at the point of origin. Also, ports require better physical security.

In developing the State Goods Movement Action Plan, BT&H and CalEPA have conducted more than 350 listening sessions in order to better understand the needs and concerns of its constituents.

The goal of the Goods Movement Action Plan is to reach consensus by December 2005 on a plan that identifies: 1) priority infrastructure projects; 2) environmental and community mitigation; 3) homeland security projects; 4) financing; and 5) federal action. The plan has identified \$14.4 billion in priority projects, of which \$12 billion are in Southern California, out of \$48 billion in identified needs. Examples of priority infrastructure projects include the I-710 corridor, Alameda Corridor East, and the BNSF rail intermodal facility. It is important to note that full funding for these projects has not yet been identified.

In terms of environmental and community mitigation, the California Air Resources Board has estimated the cost of mitigation to be between \$2 and \$5 billion. Examples of air pollution reduction measures could include incentives (e.g. Carl Moyer), agreements, regulation, and grade separation projects. It will be essential to integrate infrastructure improvements with air quality improvements and community mitigation.

The Goods Movement Action Plan is also looking at potential financing sources, such as federal (i.e. customs revenues), public-private partnerships (i.e. user fees and tolls), and state (i.e. existing revenues and Proposition 42, revenue bonds, and tax credit bonds).

In terms of process, throughout October 2005 the state convened Phase II working groups in the areas of environmental mitigation, infrastructure, finance, homeland security, community mitigation. From October to November, the state worked with the stakeholder-based integrating work group. It is expected that the Plan will be

submitted to the Governor in December, and the Governor will announce a goods movement initiative in January 2006.

Hon. Carol Herrera, City of Diamond Bar, asked whether participation from the railroads is needed to fund and implement grade separation projects. Mr. Barna responded that railroad participation is clearly needed, but the railroads were not listed separately because the state did not want to single out a particular industry.

Ms. Sharon Neely, ACE Construction Authority, asked what the status of the proposed state general obligation bonds is and how goods movement would be supported through those bonds. Mr. Barna indicated that the bonds were proposed in SB 1024 from State Senator Perata and would be a bond encompassing a range of infrastructure improvements in addition to transportation, such as seismic retrofitting. The role of transportation in this bond is being discussed because general obligation bonds are not normally used to fund transportation improvements.

Hon. Bonnie Lowenthal, City of Long Beach, asked what the \$2-5 billion estimate for environmental and community mitigation included. Mr. Barna responded that it is an estimate of what it would cost affected industries to come into compliance with targets set by the Air Resources Board given existing conditions. The cost estimate could include incentives, operational changes, and fleet changeover.

4.2 Goods Movement, Traffic, and Health: Research Connections

Professor Ed Avol, USC Keck School of Medicine, presented this item. His presentation focused on three areas: first, a description of the particles and gasses that we breathe; second, the relationship between exposure to particles and health; and third, the need for regional solutions to a regional problem.

Diesel emissions particles are very irregularly shaped and are very small. In comparison, a typical human hair is about 60 microns in diameter. A typical diesel emission particle is 0.1 microns in diameter, which is smaller than the current PM10 state and federal standard. Because diesel particles are so small and have very little mass, they stay airborne for several days. Furthermore, due to their small size these particles can potentially be deposited into a person's lungs as well as cross over the air/blood barrier in the lung. In addition, diesel particles have a very large surface area,

which means other particles can stick to diesel particles and as a result enter into the body along with the diesel particles.

The number of particles in outdoor air varies greatly by location. For example, coastal air contains about 600 particles per cubic centimeter. Along the I-110, the number of particles increases to about 135,000. Along the I-710 in Long Beach, the number of particles can range from between 300-600,000, up to a maximum of 1.5 million per cubic centimeter. This is significant because small particles more easily enter into the body.

Ultrafine particles, such as those from diesel emissions, can result in health impacts such as increased rates of asthma, birth defects, cancer, and reduced lung function. For example, studies by USC indicate that air pollution can make asthma worse and that there are more cases of asthma for those persons living within 150m of a major road. Furthermore, studies from Europe indicate that living within 300m of a major roadway can negatively affect lung function. In terms of birth defects, data from the California Birth Defect Monitoring Program indicate that in high pollution areas, babies have a 3X risk of heart related birth defects.

Mr. Avol also spoke on the I-710 Major Corridor Study and the Tier 2 Committee's recommendations regarding health and air quality. Three main recommendations include: 1) the project's #1 consideration is the ability to reduce air quality impacts; 2) air quality must be better at 'main line' construction time compared today; and 3) these steps must be taken before mainline construction can begin.

In addition to air quality impacts, there are potential community impacts from goods movement by both truck and rail and from goods movement facilities such as intermodal rail yards.

Ms. Neely asked what the impact of elevated roadways would be on pollution and the dispersion of particles. Mr. Avol responded that there have not been any studies which measured particle levels of at-grade versus elevated roadways.

Hon. Don Szerlip, City of Redondo Beach, asked what impact soundwalls have on pollution levels along the freeway. Mr. Avol responded that the soundwalls probably help to trap large particles but do not help in reducing the level of smaller particles. Hon. Szerlip also asked whether CNG (compressed natural gas) fuel emitted a higher concentration of ultrafine particles than diesel fuel. Mr. Avol responded that there could be an issue with the

concentration of particles emitted by CNG fuel, though these particles may be less reactive than particles emitted by diesel fuel. Mr. Avol emphasized that there has not been enough study on the effects of particles emitted by CNG fuel.

Mr. Steve Smith, SANBAG, asked if the emphasis to reduce health impacts should focus on technology and fuels. Mr. Avol responded that a combination of strategies is needed, including fuels, the application of filter controls, and better land use policies.

Ms. Nancy Pfeffer, SCAG, asked for more information on the Southern California Particle Research Center. Mr. Avol responded that the center is a consortium of universities including UCLA, USC, UC Riverside, Caltech, and UC Irvine and is sponsored by the US Environmental Protection Agency.

5.0 STAFF REPORT

Ms. Pfeffer announced two upcoming conferences: the first is Faster Freight Cleaner Air, which will be held January 30-February 1, 2006 at the Long Beach Convention Center. SCAG is a co-sponsor of this conference. The second is the National Urban Freight Conference, which will be held on February 1-3, 2006 at the Westin Long Beach.

Also, Ms. Pfeffer announced that a technical advisory committee for the upcoming Inland Port Feasibility Study will be formed. If anybody is interested in serving on the committee, please let staff know.

Finally, the Multi-County Goods Movement Action Plan continues to progress. The Stakeholder Advisory Group, which is open to members of the public, held its first meeting on October 26, and these meetings will be held on a bi-monthly basis. The next meeting of the Stakeholder Advisory Group will be held in January or February 2006.

6.0 COMMENT PERIOD

7.0 NEXT MEETING

The next regular GMTF meeting will be:
Wednesday, January 18, 2006
9:00am-11:00am
SCAG Offices, San Bernardino Conference Rooms A&B

8.0 ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:15 am



SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS